UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

SAVANNAH DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

v.

JOSHUA SCOTT

IVISION	FILED Scott L. Poff, Clerk United States District Court
	By jburrell at 4:36 pm, Mar 14, 2018
CR417-050	

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

On October 31, 2017, the Court ordered a forensic psychological examination of defendant Joshua Scott in accordance with 18 U.S.C. § 4241(a) and (b) to assess both his mental competency for trial and his criminal responsibility for the charged offense. Doc. 124. He has since had a comprehensive psychological evaluation at the Federal Medical Center in Lexington, Kentucky. Doc. 136. His evaluators found that he is competent to stand trial and he was sane at the time of the offense. *Id.* at 6-7 (competency opinion); doc. 136-1 at 2 (sanity opinion).

Both defendant and the government stipulate that the report should be admitted as the sole evidence on the issue of competency. Doc. 139. The Court concurs with the report's unrebutted findings and concludes that Johnson is not presently suffering from a mental disease

or defect rendering him mentally incompetent to stand trial. It is therefore **RECOMMENDED** that defendant be found competent to stand trial pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 4241.

This Report and Recommendation (R&R) is submitted to the district judge assigned to this action, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and this Court's Local Rule 72.3. Within 14 days of service, any party may file written objections to this R&R with the Court and serve a copy on all parties. The document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendations." Any request for additional time to file objections should be filed with the Clerk for consideration by the assigned district judge.

After the objections period has ended, the Clerk shall submit this R&R together with any objections to the assigned district judge. The district judge will review the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). The parties are advised that failure to timely file objections will result in the waiver of rights on appeal. 11th Cir. R. 3-1; see Symonett v. V.A. Leasing Corp., 648 F. App'x 787, 790 (11th Cir. 2016); Mitchell v. United States, 612 F. App'x 542, 545 (11th Cir. 2015).

SO REPORTED AND RECOMMENDED, this $\underline{14th}$ day of

March, 2018.

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

FR Smith